



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

paper), would nevertheless show a considerable power in the expression of delicate subjective shades of thought, not by distinct forms, but by the suggestions arising from the main completional element of the verb. This element itself may be considered a peculiar Shemitic modal conception, or at least developed in Shemitic speech to an extraordinary degree, and permitting very delicate distinctions of thought. By it the language is enabled to characterize an action as finished, or as just entering on existence and in all the stages of incompleteness. It has seized on and formally fixed the period of "becoming," the stage of advance from non-existence to existence, and has thus given a peculiar dramatic coloring to its ordinary style, while it has grouped around this idea the various conceptions of the ideal that constitute the material of modal thought in our family of languages. These last it has in common with other tongues; but the fundamental conception of completional distinction may be regarded as the Shemitic contribution to the modal material of speech—a conception that it has worked out more fully than any other linguistic family.

II.—*On the Nature of Caesura.*

By M. W. HUMPHREYS,

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

While this paper presents an independent discussion of the nature of caesura, it is so shaped that it also serves as an introduction to the following paper *On the Effects of Elision*.

1. Caesura in general serves two purposes. (a) One of these is to allow the reciter in long verses to catch his breath, in such a way, however, that he shall not be permitted to pause too long for the purpose; and accordingly, in such verses, we usually find a pause at the proper place, or at least the liberty of making a pause without impairing the sense. In the latter case occurs a slight *χρόνος κενός* or *tempus inane*, which may fall even between words closely connected. This

use of caesura is not necessary in iambic trimeters, and consequently the caesura *may* fall where a pause is not to be thought of, and *very frequently* falls where the sense, though permitting a pause, does not require it. (b) The other general use of caesura is, not to separate, but to link together the two halves, or rather principal portions, of the verse. If the verse is divided exactly in the middle, it at once falls apart into two shorter verses; and if every word-foot constitutes a verse-foot, the whole verse falls to pieces, very much as a brick wall would do, if the bricks were laid the one exactly upon the other, without any over-lapping. A thread-bare illustration is afforded by

sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret.

An example in trimeters is Agam. 943:

πιθοῦν κράτος μέντοι πάρες γ' ἑκὼν ἐμοί.

Hence, somewhere near the middle of the verse, a word must end in a foot, so that the foot, which the reciter feels to be a unit of the verse, may connect the two portions together. This prevents the reciter from pausing too long; for if he did so, he would destroy the rhythm of the foot in which the caesura occurs. And so with the other feet in the verse: the more numerous the caesurae, the more vigorous will be the recitation, as they prevent too great a pause and so insure care and attention on the part of the reader or reciter. A better way, therefore, of indicating caesura, would be to use a *vinculum* of some sort, thus: $\cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup$, rather than $\cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup - \cup$. For the sake of convenience, however, I retain the usual method. So it is not to be wondered at that we find many verses which require no pause from beginning to end. To say that such verses have no principal caesura is, in the first place, to beg the question; and, in the second, to overlook the fact that these verses regularly have a caesura at the place for the principal one. Of course I do not mean thereby to say that, for instance, Aristophanes did not write verses without any main caesura, for he certainly did, and frequently allows diaeresis after the first dipody to pass for the chief caesura—a thing not unknown in the Tragedians, especially in Aeschylus, where it is quite

common. But this is not so frequent as is usually supposed, for it is erroneously assumed that the principal caesura must be at the longest pause. Still another use of caesura, with which the present discussion is not concerned, is to conceal the cause of the pleasant rhythmical effect of verse.

Let us now proceed to illustrate the whole subject. The examples cited are not exhaustive, but merely such as I picked up when reading for other purposes. We find caesura between the subject and the verb, as AÆSCH. Theb. 15 :

βωμοῖσι, τιμᾶς || μὴ ᾽ξαιφθῆναι ποτε.

Between the verb and its object, *ibid.* 270 :

θάροςος φίλοις, λύουσα || πολεμίων φόβον.

Between an adjective and its substantive, *ibid.* 19 :

ἐξρέψατ' οἰκητῆρας || ἀσπιδηφόρους.

So Alcest. 513, 856 :

θάπτειν τιν' ἐν τῇδ' || ἡμέρα μέλλω νεκρόν.
καίπερ βαρεῖα || ξυμφορᾷ πεπληγμένος.

Even between the article and its substantive in various relative positions, Choeph. 658, Philoct. 964, Hel. 703 :

ἀγγελλε τοῖσι || κυρίοισι δωμάτων.
ἤδη ᾽στὶ καὶ τοῖς τοῦδε || προσχωρεῖν λόγοις.
οὐχ ἤδε μόχθων || τῶν ἐν Ἰλίῳ βραβεύς.

After a preposition, Oed. Rex 615, Troad. 946, 1211, Iph. Taur. 1174 :

κακὸν δὲ κἂν ἐν || ἡμέρα γνοίης μῆ.
τί δὴ φρονοῦς' ἐκ || δωμάτων ἄμ' ἐσπόμεν.
τιμῶσιν, οὐκ ἐς || πλησμονὰς θηρώμενοι.
"Απολλων, οὐδ' ἐν || βαρβάροις τόδ' ἥλπισ' ἄν.

Even after οὐ, Iph. Taur. 684 :

κοῦκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ || χρὴ ξυνεκπνεῦσαι μέ σοι.

Before postpositive words (μέν, γάρ, etc.), Orest. 360, Eur. Elect. 35 :

Ἀγαμέμνωνος μὲν || γὰρ τύχας ἠπιστάμην.
δάμαρτα, πατέρων || μὲν Μυκηναίων ἄπο.

So Eumen. 473, Hec. 549, 736, Heracl. 39, 729, 743, Herc. Fur. 69, 1126, 1396, Iph. Taur. 96, 955, 1161, 1379, Iph. Aul. 425, etc., etc.

Caesura, even between an enclitic and the preceding word, is better than no caesura: thus, Ion 574, Eur. Suppl. 727, Iph. Taur. 696, Choeph. 181, 733, Antig. 1256:

ἐγὼ θ' ὁποίας || μοι γυναικὸς ἐξέφυς.
ὅς ἐν τε τοῖς δεινοῖσιν || ἐστὶν ἄλκιμος.
κτησάμενος, ἦν ἔδωκά || σοι δάμαρτ' ἔχειν.
οὐχ ἥσσον εὐδάκρυτά || μοι λέγεις τάδε.
λύπη δ' ἄμισθός || ἐστί σοι ξυνέμπορος.
καὶ τῆς ἄγαν γάρ || ἐστί που σιγῆς βάρος.

Before postpositive ὥς, Theb. 53, Antig. 256:

ἐπνει, λεόντων || ὥς Ἄρη δεδορκότων.
λεπτὴ δ' ἄγος φεύγοντος || ὥς ἐπὴν κόνις.

It is not necessary to multiply examples of caesura between words closely connected. Suffice it to observe, that if we reject these caesurae, we shall have a vast number of verses without any main caesura, *almost all of which have this sort of caesura*. This cannot be attributed to chance. And to further strengthen my views, I shall adduce some illustrations from other verses. No one will deny that the trochaic tetrameter catalectic of the Tragedians requires diaeresis after the second dipody. There is one apparent exception to this,—ÆSCH. Pers. 165; but this will be explained in my next paper. Although this diaeresis is required, and corresponds in a certain way to the main caesura of the iambic trimeter, still it takes place between words closely connected, and that, too, in spite of the considerable length of the verse. I give here a few of the numerous instances of this: Troad. 451, 454, Ion 530, 1252, Iph. Aul. 871, 877:

ὦ στέφη τοῦ φιλάτου μοι || θεῶν, ἀγάλατ' εὖια.
δῶ θοαῖς αὔραις φέρεσθαι || σοι τάδ', ὦ μαντεῖ' ἄναξ.
καὶ τί μοι λέξεις; πατήρ σός || εἰμι καὶ σὺ παῖς ἐμός.
ἴσμεν, ὦ τάλαινα, τὰς σὰς || ξυμφορὰς, ἵν' εἴ τύχης.
ὦδ' ἔχει καὶ σοὶ μὲν εὖνονε || εἰμὶ, σῶ δ' ἥσσον πόσει.
ἀρτίφρων, πλὴν ἐς σέ καὶ σὴν || παῖδα· τοῦτο δ' οὐ φρονεῖ.

See also Iph. Aul. 860, 868, 1342, 1367, and *passim*. In some of the above examples the division takes place between an enclitic and the preceding word. This is not so strange as might appear at first sight; I can produce examples of a

grammatical pause immediately before an enclitic, as Androm. 747, SOPH. Elect. 647-8:

ἡγοῦ, τέκνον, μοι δεῦρ' ὑπ' ἀγκάλαις σταθείς.
καὶ μή, με πλούτου τοῦ παρόντος εἴ τινες
δόλοισι βουλεύουσιν ἐκβαλεῖν, ἐφῆς.

Some punctuate the last example differently; but unquestionable are Hec. 432, Hel. 1166, Heracl. 78, Antig. 544, etc., unless the vocative is read without a pause.

An enclitic can even stand at the beginning of a verse when the preceding verse is closely connected, as Heracl. 280-81:

λαμπρός δ' ἀκούσας σὴν ὕβριν φανῆσεται
σοι καὶ πολίταις γῆ τε τῇδε καὶ φυτοῖς.

Dindorf, however, writes *φανῆσεται* | *σοὶ κτέ.*

Similarly it may be shown that a *proclitic* admits a grammatical pause after it, from which fact it is evident that it was not a necessity that it should be read as a part of the word following it, and hence could admit caesura after it. Examples of pause after proclitics are SOPH. Elect. 348-9, Phæn. 1280-81:

ἤ τις λέγεις μὲν ἄρτιως ὥς, εἰ λάβοις
σθένος, τὸ τούτων μῖσος ἐκδείξιας ἄν.
ἐπειγ' ἐπειγε, θύγατερ' ὥς, ἣν μὲν φθάσω
παῖδας πρὸ λόγχης, οὐμὸς ἐν φάει βίος.

A proclitic may also stand at the end of a verse, as Plut. 878.

To illustrate further the fact that caesura may take place between words intimately connected, I shall now cite some examples from Latin poets. In Horace, who certainly did not neglect the main caesura, we find, Epod. V, 83, XVII, 6, 13, 36:

sub haec puer iam || non, ut ante, mollibus.
Canidia, parce || vocibus tandem sacris.
postquam relictis || moenibus rex procidit.
quae finis aut quod || me manet stipendium;

to say nothing of the well-known verses, Epod. XVI, 8, I, 19, XI, 15:

parentibusque abominatus Hannibal.
ut assidens inplumibus pullis avis.
quod si meis inaestuet praecordiis.

In Catullus, who never neglects caesura anywhere else, we find, IV, 18:

et inde tot per || inpotentia freta.

Of course this sort of caesura is not to be expected so much in the dactylic hexameter, on account of the length of the verse, and the consequent desirableness of having a pause in it. Still many instances do occur, as HOR. SAT. I, 4, 2-5; EPIST. I, 11, 21; 10, 14:

atque alii, quorum || comoedia prisca virorumst,
siquis erat dignus || describi, quod malus ac fur,
quod moechus foret aut || sicarius aut alioqui
famosus, multa || cum libertate notabant.
Romae laudetur || Samos et Chios et Rhodos absens.
novistine locum || potiore rure beato.

In the Homeric Poems are found many such verses as IL. N, 49, 71:

ἄλλη μὲν γὰρ ἔγωγ' || οὐ δειδία χεῖρας ἀάπτους.
ἵχνια γὰρ μετόπισθε || ποδῶν ἡδὲ κνημῶν.

And even in the so-called pentameter, whose incision (with two or three peculiar exceptions) is invariable and fixed, it may take place where there is no grammatical pause, as CATUL. 84, 12:

iam non Ionios || esse, sed Hionios.

ARCHIL. 16, 2 (Bergk):

κίονας, ὦ μεγάλη || γὰρ, ὑπένερθεν ἔχεις.

2. There is a commonly received error that caesura only takes place where a polysyllabic word-foot extends across the space between two verse-feet, and ends in the latter of them. This is utterly false. Caesura is where a word-foot, be it monosyllabic, dissyllabic, or polysyllabic, terminates in a verse-foot. There is a tendency, it is true, to avoid *diaeresis*, and especially strong is this tendency in that part of the verse where the main caesura is necessary. Consequently *diaeresis* in the dactylic hexameter is not very frequent after the second foot, but when it does occur there and a monosyllable follows it, the verse has both *diaeresis* and caesura. To say, then, that caesura excludes *diaeresis*, or rather includes the absence of *diaeresis*, is to confuse the whole matter sadly. Besides, not a few instances (although, to be sure, not very many) occur even in hexameters, as HOR. EPIST. I, 6, 40; 7, 16; 7, 52, etc.:

Ne fueris hic tu. || Chlamydes Lucullus, ut ajunt.
Iam satis est. At tu, || quantum vis, tolle. Benigne—
Demetri, (puer hic || non laeve iussa Philippi—).

And they are especially common in the Satires of Horace, as I, 1, 8, 13, 23, 32, 40, etc., etc. This is most usual in Latin where the monosyllable is preceded by elision, as Epist. I, 2, 8 :

Stultorum regum et || populorum continet aestus ;

in which case the monosyllable is often closely connected with the word after it.

But what is of especial importance for the present discussion, in iambic trimeters the caesura is frequently effected by means of a monosyllable, as Orest. 662 :

ψυχὴν δ' ἐμὴν δὲς || τῷ τάλαιπῶρῳ πατρί.

In the 801 iambic trimeters of the Alcestis this occurs 117 times ; and even if we omit instances where the monosyllable is enclitic, or a monosyllable preceding it is proclitic, there still remain 71 instances ; that is, the matter was left to take care of itself. So in the last Epode of Horace, containing 81 verses, there are 7 instances, verse 30 being an appropriate specimen :

Quid amplius vis ? || O mare et terra, ardeo.

3. It is a happy circumstance that G. Hermann denied that caesura in the *fourth* foot of iambic trimeters was ever to be regarded as the main caesura. This one view of his justifies us in disagreeing with him in anything we please, if we can support our views with arguments. But when J. H. H. Schmidt denies that the caesura in the *third* foot is of any importance, it is time to begin to get out of patience. In his *Leitfaden* he says : “ Unter 100 Versen pflegen etwa 50 Theilung (i. e. hephthemimeres), etwas mehr als 25 Einschnitt (i. e. diaeresis in the middle of the verse), etwas weniger als 25 Bruch zu haben. * * * Die sonst angenommenen Gliederungsarten, welche dem Rhythmus widerstreiten, haben keine wesentliche Bedeutung.” To reply to this would be like arguing with a man who insists that twice two is five. Schmidt has thrown great light upon the reading of Lyric Poetry, but he should not have tried to make everything lyric.